

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

BLUE SPIKE, LLC,

Plaintiff,

V.

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS, INC.,

Defendant.

Consolidated Civil Action No. 6:12-CV-499-LED

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT DAILYMOTION, INC.'S
FIRST AMENDED COUNTERCLAIMS**

Plaintiff Blue Spike, LLC files this Reply to the First Amended Counterclaims of Dailymotion, Inc.’s (“Dailymotion” or “Defendant”) (Dkt. No. 1443) as follows. All allegations not expressly admitted or responded to by Blue Spike, LLC are denied.

COUNTERCLAIMS

1. Paragraph 1 contains no allegations requiring an admission or denial.
2. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 2 and therefore denies them.
3. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 3 and therefore denies them.
4. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 4 and therefore denies them.
5. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 5 and therefore denies them.
6. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 6 and therefore denies them.

7. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 7 and therefore denies them.
8. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 8 and therefore denies them.
9. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 9 and therefore denies them.
10. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 10 and therefore denies them.
11. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 11 and therefore denies them.
12. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 12 and therefore denies them.
13. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 13 and therefore denies them.
14. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 14 and therefore denies them.
15. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 15 and therefore denies them.
16. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 16 and therefore denies them.
17. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 17 and therefore denies them.

18. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 18 and therefore denies them.

19. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 19 and therefore denies them.

20. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 20 and therefore denies them.

21. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 21 and therefore denies them.

22. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 22 and therefore denies them.

23. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 23 and therefore denies them.

24. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 24 and therefore denies them.

25. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 25 and therefore denies them.

26. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 26 and therefore denies them.

27. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 27 and therefore denies them.

28. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 28 and therefore denies them.

29. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 29 and therefore denies them.

30. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 30 and therefore denies them.

31. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 31 and therefore denies them.

32. Blue Spike, LLC is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 32 and therefore denies them.

33. Blue Spike, LLC admits that an actual controversy exists between Blue Spike, LLC and Defendant by virtue of the allegations of Blue Spike, LLC's Complaint and First Amended Complaint and Defendant's Answers and Counterclaims.

34. Paragraph 34 contains no allegations requiring an admission or denial.

COUNT ONE
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '175 Patent)

35. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-34.

36. Blue Spike, LLC admits the allegations of Paragraph 36.

37. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 37.

38. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 38.

COUNT TWO
(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '175 Patent)

39. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-38.

40. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 40.

41. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 41.

COUNT THREE
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '494 Patent)

42. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-41.

43. Blue Spike, LLC admits the allegations of Paragraph 43.

44. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 44.

45. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 45.

COUNT FOUR
(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '494 Patent)

46. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-45.

47. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 47.

48. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 48.

COUNT FIVE
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '700 Patent)

49. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-48.

50. Blue Spike, LLC admits the allegations of Paragraph 50.

51. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 51.

52. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 52.

COUNT SIX
(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '700 Patent)

53. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-52.

54. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 54.
55. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 55.

COUNT SEVEN
(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement of the '472 Patent)

56. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-55.
57. Blue Spike, LLC admits the allegations of Paragraph 57.
58. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 58.
59. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 59.

COUNT EIGHT
(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '472 Patent)

60. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-59.
61. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 61.
62. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 62.

COUNT NINE
(Inequitable Conduct)

63. Blue Spike, LLC repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-62.
64. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 64.
65. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 65.
66. Blue Spike, LLC denies the allegations of Paragraph 66.
67. Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to the relief it seeks in Paragraph 67.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Blue Spike, LLC denies that Defendant is entitled to any of the relief it requests.

**REQUEST FOR RELIEF
PLAINTIFF'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

In addition to the relief requested in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, Blue Spike, LLC respectfully requests a judgment against Defendant as follows:

- (a) That Defendant take nothing by its Counterclaims;
- (b) That the Court award Blue Spike, LLC its costs and attorneys' fees incurred in defending against these Counterclaims; and
- (c) Any and all further relief for the Blue Spike, LLC as the Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Randall T. Garteiser
Randall T. Garteiser
Texas Bar No. 24038912
rgarteiser@ghiplaw.com
Christopher A. Honea
Texas Bar No. 24059967
chonea@ghiplaw.com
Christopher S. Johns
Texas Bar No. 24044849
cjohns@ghiplaw.com
Kirk J. Anderson
California Bar No. 289043
Peter S. Brasher
California Bar No. 283992
GARTEISER HONEA, P.C.
218 N. College Ave.
Tyler, Texas 75702
Telephone: (903) 705-7420
Facsimile: (888) 908-4400

Counsel for Blue Spike LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Randall T. Garteiser, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this document. I hereby certify that all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system per Local Rule CV-5(a)(3) on this day. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5, this document was served via U.S. Mail and electronic means to counsel for Defendant that are not receiving this document via CM/ECF.

/s/ Randall T. Garteiser
Randall T. Garteiser